

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 282 587

JC 870 095

TITLE California Community College Reform. Final Report. Advance Copy.

INSTITUTION California State Legislature, Sacramento. Joint Committee for Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education.

PUB DATE 7 Jan 87

NOTE 50p.

AVAILABLE FROM Joint Publications, Box 90, State Capitol, Sacramento, CA 95814 (\$4.26).

PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Access to Education; *Change Strategies; *Community Colleges; Educational Assessment; *Educational Change; Educational Finance; *Educational Improvement; Governance; Institutional Mission; School Personnel; State Legislation; *Statewide Planning; Two Year Colleges

IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

The proposals presented in this report were developed by the Joint Committee for Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education with the intention of strengthening the capacity of the California community colleges to meet the state's emerging economic and demographic needs. After section I provides a general introduction and statement of intent, section II addresses issues related to access to education and student success, with proposals concerning assessment, counseling, and placement. Section III focuses on mission and function, including proposals related to transfer and vocational education, remediation, English as a Second Language, adult education, and fee-based community services. Section IV presents proposals regarding faculty, administrators, and staff, which deal with credentials; recruitment; affirmative action; part-time faculty; tenure; collective bargaining; student services staff; personal, professional, and intellectual development; and institutional development. Section V deals with community college governance, including recommendations related to the state board of governors, district governing boards, and campus governance. Finally, section VI makes proposals regarding community college finance. Dissenting opinions from the committee are appended. (EJV)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED282587

ADVANCE COPY
FINAL REPORT

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
REFORM

Joint Committee for Review of
the Master Plan for Higher
Education

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John Vasconcellos

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

January 7, 1987

Jc 870 095



California Legislature

Joint Committee For Review Of The Master Plan For Higher Education

1100 "J" STREET, FIFTH FLOOR
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814
(916) 324-8141

ASSEMBLYMAN JOHN VASCONCELLOS
CHAIR

COMMITTEE STAFF
M BRIAN MURPHY
CHIEF CONSULTANT
OLGA LARA
ASSOCIATE CONSULTANT
CASSIE VAN TICE
COMMITTEE SECRETARY

ASSEMBLY MEMBERS
DORIS ALLEN
CHARLES BADER
SAM FARR
TOM HAYDEN
TERESA HUGHES
PHILLIP ISENBERG
WILLIAM LEONARD
TOM MCCLINTOCK
JOHN VASCONCELLOS

SENATE MEMBERS
MARIAN BERGESON
BILL GREENE
GARY HART
JOSEPH MONTOYA
REBECCA MORGAN
JIM NIELSEN
JOHN SEYMOUR
WALTER STIERN
ART TORRES

The California Community Colleges are a proud part of California's historical commitment to provide wide access to quality higher education. The California State Legislature's Joint Committee for Review of the Master Plan is proud to make this contribution to the current dialogue about the future of these fine institutions. The Joint Committee received the report "The Challenge of Change" from the Commission for Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education in May 1986; our Joint Committee report reflects the fine work of the Commission, our own analysis and dialogue, and the invaluable public testimony of many Community College teachers, administrators, statewide representatives and students.

This report was adopted unanimously by the members of the Joint Committee, who made a bipartisan commitment early in our discussions to search for consensus on the important policy issues before us. While some individual members of the Committee have dissented on specific items, we share a deeper consensus -- that the Community Colleges continue to fulfill their rich promise as an integral part of California's future.

Assembly Members:

John Vasconcellos, Chair
Charles Bader
Doris Allen
Sam Farr
Tom Hayden
Teresa Hughes
Phillip Isenberg
William Leonard
Tom McClintock

Senate Members:

Gary Hart, Vice Chair
Jim Nielsen
Marian Bergeson
Bill Greene
Joseph Montoya
Rebecca Morgan
Nicholas Petris
John Seymour
Walter Stiern (retired)
Art Torres

Committee Staff:

M. Brian Murphy
Chief Consultant
Olga Lara
Associate Consultant

Cassie Van Tice
Admin. Assistant
Jorie Lindfeldt
Secretary

I. INTRODUCTION/INTENT	1
II. ACCESS/SUCCESS	4
Assessment, Counselling and placement	4
III. MISSION AND FUNCTIONS	8
Transfer Education	10
Vocational Education	11
Remediation	14
English as a Second Language	15
State-Funded Non-credit Adult Education	16
Fee-Based Community Services	18
IV. FACULTY, ADMINISTRATORS AND STAFF	19
Credentials	19
Recruitment and Affirmative Action	21
Employment of Part-time Faculty	22
Tenure	24
Collective Bargaining	25
Student Services Staff	25
Personal, Professional and Intellectual Development	26
Institutional Development	28
V. GOVERNANCE OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES	29
Board of Governors	30
District Governing Boards	32
Campus Governance	33
VI. COMMUNITY COLLEGE FINANCE	35
 APPENDIX A; DISSENTING OPINIONS	 A-1

I. INTRODUCTION/INTENT

The California Community Colleges face an unprecedented challenge in the coming two decades, as California undergoes a major demographic, social and economic transformation. The Community Colleges are at the center of this change, and the state's future as a healthy and free, diverse and creative society, depends in no little part upon the commitments expressed through and in the community colleges.

This is not hyperbole; the community colleges educate hundreds of thousands of Californians every year, they are the route to higher education for the majority of our people, they provide access to language and citizenship for tens of thousands of immigrants annually, they retrain workers in an economy changing more rapidly than any in history, they are the last hope for older citizens seeking skills and involvement in their communities. To do these things well, to bring excitement and power into the lives of students so diverse and needing so much, to serve the economy and society through its service of these students--this requires a deep commitment from all who teach and learn, from those who administer and counsel, from those who fund and regulate.

The Community Colleges embody an historic commitment to provide an opportunity for college instruction for all Californians capable of benefiting from instruction. The Colleges have historically found their Mission in the statewide plan for higher education--the Master Plan--and in local commitments to meet the needs of different communities--urban and rural, middle class and poor. From these sources have come the conviction--and the fact--that the colleges ought to provide high quality lower division instruction for purposes of transfer to baccalaureate institutions, and a wide range of courses and programs to meet vocational and basic education needs. The colleges have been notable because they were local and accessible, diverse in their responsiveness to local needs, and yet maintained standards capable of placing students in any of the state's universities or employable in any of the state's industries.

Since the original Master Plan, there has been a significant change in the populations served by the Community Colleges, and in the anticipated needs of the state as we move into the 21st Century.

The state's population will grow by 25 percent between 1986 and 2000, from 25.5 million to roughly 32 million. By the turn of the century California will have a cultural and ethnic pluralism unknown elsewhere in the mainland United States. 52 percent of the school-age children in 2000 will be minorities; the majority of the population will be nonwhite early into the following decade. But there is no one "minority community"; there will be recent immigrants from Asia and Central America, the children of today's urban ghettos, members of the "working poor". Whether it be language training, job re-skilling,

technical education or the liberal arts, these communities of Californians will turn increasingly to the Community Colleges. And given the pitiful record of the primary and secondary schools in educating or (even) retaining minorities, the Community Colleges will continue to be their last hope for any education at all.

By the year 2000, California will be proportionally older; 19 percent will be senior citizens. California will have more elderly citizens than any other state in the nation. These citizens will turn, as they have already, to the Community Colleges for continuing education and job skills.

And by the turn of the century more and more working men and women will come to the community colleges for job skills and retraining. In an economy of rapid change and intense international competition, there will be much job displacement, sometimes on a massive scale. The periodic recession, the unpredicted collapse of a market or an industry--all will bring new students to the colleges. But inside the economic center--not just at its margins--the workers of the future will need new literacy skills, more ability to communicate and learn on their own. And when some analysts predict a labor shortage in California by 2000, the real issue will not be numbers but quality; will working men and women have the skills required for jobs of rapid transformation? Will California be able to compete economically with other states now making massive investment in their educational systems?

Let us not be sanguine or romantic about this future of rapid change. The convergence of these tendencies--both demographic and economic--lead to the possibility of an increasingly stratified society. This can include what Cornel Meier calls a "permanent underclass", mostly minority, and a semipermanent semi-employable stratum of low-skilled workers. The consequences of this are dire: the permanent under-utilization of the energies and talents of our people, the deepening of racial resentments and fears, and the constant anxiety among more and more of us that the future has no place for us.

We are committed to an alternative vision, in which California remains a place of opportunity and hope, where innovation and creativity mark our economy and our culture, where the minds and spirits of all our communities contribute to our common future.

The Community Colleges will be at the heart of whatever effort we make to insure that the future is equitable and open, that California's economy remains healthy and growing, that both rural towns and rapidly expanding urban centers have educational resources close at hand. The Community Colleges are not the only place in which Californians will make their investment for an expansive and decent future, but they will have to be one such place.

What will it mean that these colleges--once envisaged as "Junior Colleges" devoted primarily to providing middle-class youth with a local option to the lower-division years of

college--will be called upon for the tasks of retraining workers, teaching English to those recently among us, providing skills and opportunities for the elderly, providing a second chance to those who were failed by our secondary schools, and still provide lower division transfer education of quality and integrity for all who want it?

Some fear that they will cease to be colleges, as if "college" stood as an abstract category in which students do a fairly narrow set of things. Others will welcome this new epoch as a challenge of unprecedented opportunity: Does this state have the wit and the will to forge a new range of educational engagements for our people? Can the faculty honor those who teach basic skills and literacy--as well as those who teach Shakespeare and Plato? Can "vocational" and "liberal arts" talk to each other in an epoch where all vocations will require deeper and more subtle forms of literacy? Can we build a new and diverse curriculum which engages all our diverse students, and demands the best of their minds and spirits?

At the heart of it all will be a form of pride. We can be proud of a system of community colleges which insists upon pride among its students and faculty, where rigor and standards are an assumed part of a shared effort to educate, where the hugely diverse needs of students are a challenge rather than a threat, where the Community Colleges serve as models for new curricula and innovative teaching, where learning is what we care about most.

The following proposals intend to strengthen the colleges' capacity to meet the emerging needs of our state. These are the overriding goals: to better insure that all Californians are offered a chance, challenged and taught with imagination and inspiration, offered assistance and counseling and held to honest standards. The proposals come together as a package; they are linked together both conceptually and practically. Thus, matriculation requires staff development, faculty renewal requires changes in both faculty governance and intellectual environment, a new set of priorities and goals requires funding formulae capable of ensuring the colleges' capacity to perform--and be held accountable.

II. ACCESS/SUCCESS

To assure that California enjoys a healthy economy and society, open access to a quality Community College must be affirmed for a diverse student population. This diversity reflects the diversity of the state; Community College students are recent high school graduates and senior citizens, white and black, Asian and Hispanic, disabled men and women, middle class and low-income, business men and women, single parents, re-entry women, drop outs and university graduates. As a society and a state, we have a responsibility to provide to every Californian the opportunity to further develop and realize his or her intellectual, emotional, and vocational potential.

These students' goals and aspirations are equally diverse: literacy training, English acquisition and development for native and non-native speakers, vocational training, job re-skilling, skills enhancement and transfer education. Oftentimes, the goals change during the course of the educational experience; students entering for literacy training or English acquisition realize they possess vocational or transfer education skills. The heart of education is assisting the individual to get from where they are upon entering the Community College to where they want to be. The responsibility and accountability for the growth and development which occurs between these two points lies with both the student and the college.

Access to education is only meaningful if there are programs which assist students in identifying their talents and abilities, directs them to courses which provide what they need and insists upon maintaining standards which can guide them to success.

Assessment, Counseling and Placement

1. The Legislature hereby reaffirms its commitment to open access to community colleges for all adults who can benefit from instruction, and further affirms that access is only meaningful if it is connected to programs which can best guarantee success for students. Such programs must include a system of assessment, counseling, and placement, to better ensure that students are placed in courses in which they can be expected to succeed.

2. It is the intent of the Legislature that the Board of Governors shall cause to be implemented in all local districts, a system of assessment, counseling, and placement for all students seeking access to courses and programs. Assessment shall be sensitive to both cognitive and noncognitive skills and include face-to-face personal assessment of individual motivations and aspirations. The assessment process shall be the occasion for the student to develop a program of study which meets his or her career goals, is realistic about the courses and skills required to be successful in reaching those goals, and which challenges the students to achieve to the best of their abilities. This system shall include frequent follow-up on the progress of each student with the necessary subsequent counseling, and assistance provided to ameliorate academic difficulties.

3. It is the Intent of the Legislature that a mandatory assessment and counseling system is intended to facilitate, and not restrict, access to college instruction, and to further enhance student awareness of his or her own abilities, skills, goals, and potential. To implement this intention, the Board of Governors shall in broad consultation with faculty, administrators, and support staff, evaluate existing assessment instruments, with a view to identifying a range of instruments which are both reliable and sensitive to cultural and linguistic differences; this range of instruments shall then be available to local districts for use. In the event a local district has developed an alternative assessment process—one which satisfies the requirement of cultural and linguistic sensitivities—local districts may seek a waiver from the Board of Governors' approved list of assessment instruments.

4. It is the intent of the Legislature that local districts and colleges shall develop community outreach programs directed at local communities which explain that a mandatory assessment and counseling system is intended to facilitate, and not restrict, access to college instruction, and to further enhance student awareness of his or her own abilities, skills and potential.

5. It is the intent of the Legislature that local districts and colleges shall develop orientation programs to explain academic requirements and regulations and student support services available to facilitate success.

6. It is the intent of the Legislature that participation in the assessment and counseling system shall be mandatory for all students entering the community colleges, with the exception of students taking fee-supported community service offerings. Upon completion of an adequate assessment, students shall be counseled as to the appropriate courses they need to reach their educational objectives.

7. It is further the intent of the Legislature that the Board of Governors shall instruct the local districts and colleges to initiate a review of all entry level collegiate courses with a view to identifying the skills normally expected for students to successfully complete those courses. This review shall be available to all counselors for purposes of more precise and careful counseling of students.

8. It is further the intent of the Legislature that the skill levels characterizing entry level courses be widely publicized throughout the local area feeder schools, that the colleges develop orientation programs in local high schools to explain both expected college skills and available support services.

9. It is the intent of the Legislature that the Board of Governors shall develop appropriate models and guidelines for the review of skill levels normally expected for success in entry level courses; such models and guidelines shall be available for the use of local districts. Such methodologies should include a careful review of success rates among students at different skill levels for each entry-level course, over a period of not less than two years.

10. It is further our intention that all districts shall undertake a review of their departments, programs, and student services with regard to the availability of courses and services which would satisfy the diversity of student and community needs.

11. It is the understanding of the Legislature that a statewide system of assessment, counseling and placement depends for its integrity upon the training of college staff in the methods and interpretation of formal assessment instruments, and in the diverse needs and backgrounds of the colleges' students. The Legislature further declares that any system of assessment, counseling and placement must involve the faculty. It is therefore the intent of the Legislature that there shall be developed, in each district, programs of staff and faculty development aiming to instruct faculty and staff in these matters.

12. It is our belief that the full implementation of an assessment, counseling and placement system must include an adequate review of its success, over review periods of two years. Such reviews shall include but not be limited to retention rates, transfer and vocational completion rates, improved skill levels as measured by exit testing of courses, impact of programs on gender and ethnic representation. It is our intent that the Chancellor's Office shall develop a system of review and report to the Legislature upon completion of the initial review. (c.f. MPC REC #33)

13. It is the intent of the Legislature that to further enhance success, local districts and colleges shall develop career resource and placement centers to maintain information on vocational, technological and educational opportunities, as well as facilitate career employment.

14. It is the understanding of the Legislature that this system of assessment, counseling and placement represents a major commitment of personnel and resources on the part of the colleges. There is a need for computer monitoring systems, additional staff, staff and faculty training, adequate oversight staff and resources in the Chancellor's Office. The program's success, further, depends on the successful implementation of other proposals of this report--and upon the State's willingness to commit adequate resources to it.

III. MISSION AND FUNCTIONS

The Community Colleges do many things, but what are their primary goals? What ends do they serve in California's future, as we make the transition into the next century? Any statement of Mission serves to clarify what we believe the colleges ought to care about; it also serves to identify what the state really needs.

We believe the Community Colleges will be called upon to serve three major ends as we move into the next century. First, they must provide transfer education of the finest quality for all those who choose to pursue a baccalaureate degree--and whose circumstances or prior experience make it difficult or hard for them to attend either university system. The lower division general education, liberal arts and science courses, should be of equal or superior quality to that offered in either university system, and students who seek to transfer should be guaranteed that their success in community colleges will insure entrance to the universities.

Second, the community colleges will play a pivotal role in the provision of quality vocational education in an economy of increasing complexity and rapid change. Indeed, we believe that the Community Colleges should play a central role in reorganizing the bewildering array of vocational programs offered throughout the state, and that a thorough review of vocational education will be required in the context of the overall Master Plan review.

Third, the Community Colleges will continue to provide quality programs in transitional education (i.e., remedial education and English as a Second Language courses appropriate and intended to lead to success in college and university work) for hundreds of thousands of California's citizens. No one can believe that the state's need for adult literacy, skill remediation at all levels, and English as a second language will decrease in the next 25 years. In these areas, the alternative adult education programs have been at their limits for years, and currently turn students away for lack of space. The need, in brief, is monumental, especially if California is to have a literate and productive population. We call this cluster of educational programs "transitional" because they provide a crucial transition to genuine opportunity for newer immigrants (ESL), and the underprepared student (Remediation). Community Colleges have programs of quality and integrity in these areas; they must be strengthened, given appropriate standards and made accountable for the success of their students.

Our review of the historic passage through which California is moving suggest that remedial education and English as a second language are essential if we are to address the problems of productivity and participation in the economy and society. In each of these areas there is monumental social need, a lack of leadership and coordination in

existing programs, and confusion concerning standards and accountability. The community colleges have the infrastructure and personnel, the experience and the knowledge regarding remediation and English as a second language which are appropriate and intended to lead to college success.

While all three areas--transfer, vocational, and transitional education--will engage the colleges in the coming decades, how should we view their primary Mission? We believe it is important to reaffirm that the colleges will continue to demonstrate strength and success in their primary tasks of providing quality lower-division collegiate and transfer education, and providing quality programs leading to employment. And, at the same time, we recognize the emergence of transitional education as an essential task of the colleges during the current period.

Accordingly, we affirm:

15. That the Primary Missions of the Community Colleges are the provision of quality lower-division instruction which can lead to transfer to a four-year institution, and vocational education.

16. That remedial education and English as a second language be affirmed and supported as essential and important functions of the Community Colleges.

17. Further, we affirm that state-funded, non-credit adult education should be an essential and important function of the Community Colleges. In a variety of areas these courses meet the essential needs of diverse local communities. These courses are especially critical for citizens seeking literacy, the elderly, the disabled, and recent immigrants. In all these areas, the offerings of the colleges are essential for the continuing health and successful integration of citizens into the society.

18. Further, we affirm that fee-based community service education should be affirmed as an authorized function of the Community Colleges, especially where such programs meet demonstrated local needs. We feel it important that these courses have integrity, that their inclusion into the planning of the colleges not harm the programs and offerings in other areas, and that they be genuinely and full fee-supported.

19. Finally, we affirm that excellent student services programs (including financial aid, personal counseling, health counseling, career counseling and placement, EOPS, handicapped services and tutorial services) must be understood as an essential and important part of the Community Colleges' capacity to perform their functions and meet their goals.

Transfer Education

As the Master Plan Commission has noted in its report, there are a variety of factors contributing to the decline in the numbers of students seeking to transfer from the Community Colleges to the university systems, ranging from decreased numbers of high school graduates to inadequate financial aid. But whatever the cause, the decline represents a serious threat to the long tradition of collegiate work in the colleges--as well as a threat to the oldest claims of the community colleges to provide access to quality education regardless of family or personal circumstance. We believe that a reinvigorated transfer program in the Community Colleges--and the sharing of responsibility for its success with the other segments--is a key element in the colleges' ability to meet the needs of the state in the coming years. We further recognize that quality courses and programs in the "Transfer" area include a wide range of courses of baccalaureate quality taken by students not seeking to transfer (or who may already have a baccalaureate degree); we affirm that these courses meet a growing need in California.

Therefore, we propose that it be the intent of the Legislature:

20. That the Board of Governors, the Regents of the University of California, and the Trustees of the California State University, with appropriate faculty consultation, cooperatively develop and maintain a general education transfer core curriculum which, with the courses required for specific majors, will ensure transfer to the University of California or the California State University systems upon successful completion of the appropriate courses and maintenance of the requisite grade point average. (MPC REC. #8)

21. That the Board of Governors communicate the core curriculum to the State Board of Education to be used as part of its curriculum development procedures, so that secondary school students are aware of the requirements for collegiate preparation and transfer and can receive any necessary remediation at the earliest possible opportunity. (MPC REC. #9)

22. That the specific requirements for collegiate preparation and transfer be published jointly by the Board of Governors, the Regents of the University of California, and the Trustees of the California State University, and distributed to all junior high schools, high schools, and community colleges in California, with particular attention to schools with high minority student populations. (MPC REC. #10)

23. That the Board of Governors redesign both the Associate in Arts (AA) and the Associate in Science (AS) degree requirements to include the transfer core curriculum, courses for specific college majors, and elective requirements. No courses beyond these areas should be required for the AA or AS degrees. Degrees should be awarded upon completion of the core curriculum, major, and elective requirements. (MPC REC. #11)

24. That the Board of Governors invite and encourage the independent four-year institutions to participate in the development of the core curriculum and the efforts to improve the transfer function, and to consider their applicability to their own institutions. (MPC REC. #13)

25. That the Commission for Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education, as part of its continuing study of the relationships between the three segments of higher education, examine the current ratios of lower-division students attending each of the systems, and determine if an adjustment is in order--to help insure that adequate places in upper-division majors remain open for community college transfer students.

Vocational Education

We reaffirm that vocational and technical education is a central part of the Mission of the California Community Colleges, and that programs of study leading to employment meet the needs of both students and society. It is our conviction, however, that the dramatic changes in California's economy will require a thorough review of the relevance and responsiveness of current vocational programs, as well as the relationship between the various and many programs throughout the state. It is the expectation of the Legislature that the Master Plan Commission will conduct such a review, and it is further our expectation that the Board of Governors shall initiate, through the Chancellor's Office, a more detailed examination of the implications of current economic developments and trends for the development of vocational programs. In agriculture, manufacturing, and the services sectors, new technologies, the reorganization of production, and the shifting

international context require such a review. The future development of vocational programs should be informed by a richer analysis of these economic developments. We propose:

26. That it is the intent of the Legislature that the Board of Governors shall establish an office through which the Board can monitor on-going macroeconomic and employment data, initiate dialogue with industry groups, and assist districts in identifying future needs and vocational programs.

It is our understanding that current vocational programs in the Community Colleges appropriately include both certificate/degree programs and short-term jobs skills and retraining programs. Both are essential to meet the rapidly shifting needs within the economy. Within a variety of programs, however, there is a need for greater continuity between the high schools, Community Colleges, and University systems.

Therefore, we propose that it be the intent of the Legislature:

27. That the Board of Governors and the State Board of Education, with appropriate faculty consultation, help local high schools and Community Colleges to establish closely articulated "2+2" programs--two years in high school, two in a Community College--where such programs would meet local student and employer needs, and that in cooperation with the Trustees of the California State University, with appropriate faculty consultation, develop articulated "2+2+2" vocational programs leading to the baccalaureate degree where appropriate. (MPC REC. #15)

It is further our belief that vocational "tracks" should have as much connection as possible with courses in the liberal arts and general education. This ensures career options for students, and addresses a growing conviction on the part of industry that vocational training must include a broad variety of literacy skills beyond technical expertise. We believe that the Chancellor's Office should initiate a review of the curricular relationships between vocational and general education programs. And with regard to transfer vocational programs, it is our intent,

28. That the Board of Governors and the Trustees of the California State University cooperatively establish vocational education transfer programs, ensuring articulation at both the State and local levels, with faculty from both segments cooperating in curriculum development. Vocational students seeking an AS degree should be required to satisfy the transfer core curriculum and courses specific to occupational major requirements. Local colleges should be authorized to award the AS degree upon completion of the transfer core curriculum, occupational major, and elective requirements. (MPC REC. #16)

We agree with the Master Plan Commission that there exists patterns of gender and ethnic underrepresentation in a number of vocational programs. (As an example, in 15 of the 30 largest programs over 80 percent of the students are of the same gender.) It is our intent, therefore,

29. That the Board of Governors and the State Board of Education each identify their vocational programs that show evidence of underrepresentation of specific groups and together assist the colleges in developing programs, in cooperation with local secondary schools, to encourage students to enter those vocational programs in which they are underrepresented. (MPC REC. #14)

We are concerned about the lack of information and data concerning the success rates (as measured by skill assessment, as well as job placement and employment) in vocational programs. We believe it would be useful if the Chancellor's Office implemented a uniform reporting procedure for vocational programs, including placement by gender and ethnicity. Such a reporting procedure is essential if the Board of Governors, the Legislature, and the Governor are to assess the colleges' success in fulfilling this mission. To these ends, it is our intention:

30. That the Board of Governors establish research and evaluation programs for vocational-student and employer follow-up at both the State and local levels, to determine whether each vocational program is functioning effectively and meeting student and employer needs. The Board of Governors should establish statewide evaluation measures for comparative purposes and assist the colleges in designing appropriate research and follow-up mechanisms. Results should be published statewide in a timely fashion. (MPC REC. #32)

We are familiar with current proposals concerning the establishment of an additional degree for employment certification in the Community Colleges (the AAS degree), and the identification of certain colleges as technical colleges. It is our intent,

31. That the Board of Governors and the California Postsecondary Education Commission study the appropriateness of the AAS degree, such a study to include the experience of other states and the support for the AAS in the field, the impact of the AAS on the breath of curricular offerings and on a student's education and career options. If found valuable, the Board of Governors shall develop and propose a plan regarding its implementation, the experience of other states and the implications for California, and report back to the Legislature by January 1, 1988.

Finally, we believe that the comprehensive mission of the Community Colleges is appropriate, and that it is, not inappropriate that individual colleges have a technical focus or emphasis in their curriculum.

Remediation

The Master Plan Commission reports: "The demand for remedial education has increased in all postsecondary segments, but especially in the Community Colleges, because of the decline in high school standards, the increasing dropout rate, the cap on growth of adult education programs in the public schools, and the growing numbers of adults who seek basic skills, language, and literacy training. While higher proportions of ethnic minority students need remedial courses and programs, the need cuts across all ethnic groups and affects students from all socioeconomic backgrounds, high school graduates or not."

It is our conviction that remedial education meets a massive and growing need in the state. Remedial education provides the crucial transition to opportunity for the underprepared student, and the community colleges have considerable experience in offering students such opportunity. At the same time, we believe that there must be better coordination between adult education programs and community college programs at the local level, and we, therefore, affirm the necessity of locally negotiated agreements between the institutions providing remediation. Students in any programs must have readily available information concerning the connection between his or her current courses and the "next" stage through which he or she might pass.

Regarding remedial education, we affirm:

32. That the success of the assessment, counseling, and placement system depends upon the ability of the districts to provide a full range of skill-remediation courses and support services.

33. That students enrolled in remedial instruction courses shall be required, as are all other students, to demonstrate consistent and steady progress toward the attainment of college-level courses in a reasonable period of time. It shall be the task of counseling and support-service staff, along with the faculty, to assess the progress of each student. It is the intent of the Legislature that the Board of Governors shall examine and review the current system-wide standards for student probation and dismissal, and that these standards be widely known and understood by staff evaluating student progress.

34. That students requiring remedial instruction be directed and counseled to seek such instruction. Enrollment in non-remedial courses should be contingent upon the completion of course prerequisites, where applicable.

35. That the Board of Governors establish a limit to the number of units of remedial coursework a student may take. The Commission endorses a limit of thirty semester or forty-five quarter credit units. Students needing additional remedial work should be directed to non-credit adult basic education programs, in either the Community Colleges or the adult schools, or to other community-based services. English as a Second Language and learning-disabled students should be exempt from the unit limit, and college counselors should be permitted to request waivers for students who reach the unit limit but are still showing significant, measurable progress toward acquisition of college-level skills. (MPC REC. #22)

English as a Second Language

Courses in English as a Second Language (ESL) are the single largest category of courses, with the largest enrollment, across all segments of education in California. These courses are the heart of California's transition to a future as a multicultural society in which men and women of diverse backgrounds can also share a common language. For hundreds of thousands of recent immigrants from Central and Latin America and Asia, ESL courses offer the critical transition from exclusion to inclusion, from silence to participation. In San Francisco alone, one of every three limited English speaking adults is

currently enrolled in ESL courses offered through the College Centers division of the local district.

The students moving through this transition are enormously varied. They may be California-born, lacking both reading and computational skills as well as English; they may be literate in their own language, or not; they might have advanced degree from their original homeland, have professional and technical skills. This diversity reveals a critical insight: English as a Second Language is not remediation; it does not represent the effort to retrain. It is a new skill for men and women often perfectly competent in their own language.

We affirm the historic importance of courses and program in English as a Second Language. We recognize that current programs offered in the Community Colleges and the adult schools are inadequate to meet a growing need throughout the State. We, therefore, believe that the Community Colleges should take a lead position in coordinating programs in this area.

We propose that:

36. It is the intent of the Legislature that the California Postsecondary Education Commission and the State Department of Education undertake a review of the future needs in the area of ESL, and seek to propose programs of cooperation between the different institutions attempting to meet this need. Such a review should include an assessment of programs offered through the community colleges, UC, CSU and adult education. The results of this review are to be delivered to the Legislature no later than January 1, 1988.

State-Funded Non-Credit Adult Education

The Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education states: "Adult literacy training and basic skills education are expected to join English as a Second Language and Remediation as the most difficult challenges facing California education in the next 15 years."

The Commission may understate the case. Using 1980 census figures, up to 25 percent of California's adult population may be functionally illiterate. The State Department of Education estimates that between 4 and 4-1/2 million California adults may be illiterate; in Los Angeles alone, 465,000 out of 2.3 million adults are estimated illiterate. While precise estimates vary, this means a huge number of Californians cannot read the newspaper, cannot read work manuals, cannot read labels on cans of poison, cannot assess the written claims of businesses or politicians. There may be a connection between America's illiteracy rate and our low rate of voting. Our illiteracy is worse than

that of any other industrial democracy, and the percentage of our citizens voting in elections is the lowest of any democracy in the entire world, with the exception of Botswana.

The cost to the state is incalculable--in terms of lost productivity, higher welfare and public assistance expenditures, unemployment and crime, social isolation and personal exclusion. Democracy itself depends upon an informed and engaged population, one capable of making informed choices. Community College courses in non-credit adult education address the problem of illiteracy in addition to essential programs in nine other areas. We affirm that these programs are essential and important functions of the California Community Colleges. At the same time, we note that these programs are also offered by other institutions and governed by a variety of authorities. The programs offered within Community Colleges have quality and integrity; they should be strengthened further. But their relationship to other programs must be clarified.

Therefore, we propose that it be the intent of the Legislature:

37. That the California Postsecondary Education Commission, in consultation with the Board of Governors and the State Board of Education, conduct a study of the current and projected need for and funding of non-credit adult education, including the ten state-funded areas, in the Community Colleges and public school system adult schools in light of the State's changing demographics. The results of this study should be delivered to the Legislature no later than January 1, 1988. (MPC REC. #26)

38. Following the receipt of the above referenced report, the Legislature strengthen the current statutes by mandating local delineation of function agreements. The agreements should be reviewed and approved by the Board of Governors and the State Board of Education. Sanctions for noncompliance should be established in order to ensure cooperation between the public schools and the Community Colleges. (Such sanctions could include the Board of Governors and the State Board of Education each selecting one representative, and these two selecting a third person, to draft delineation of function agreements for any districts that are not able to reach agreement. An additional sanction could include the Board of Governors and the State Board of Education jointly agreeing not to release any funds for non-credit adult education to a particular region, pending signing and filing of the delineation of function agreement.) (MPC REC. 27)

39. Finally, we are aware of real and substantial inequities in the financial support afforded different programs in this area. It is our intent that the California Postsecondary Education Commission prepare a study of the financing of the different systems providing adult basic education, including salary schedules for persons teaching in various programs, and report back to the Legislature on the implications and effect of these differences.

Fee-Based Community Services

These offerings include avocational, recreational, and professional in-service classes as well as cultural and community programs. In many communities, particularly in rural areas, the colleges are the only resources available for such programs of enrichment. They are especially important--along with state supported non-credit adult programs--for senior citizens. We believe these courses are valuable and necessary, and also believe that they should be fully supported by user fees. Finally, we believe these programs must not inhibit the colleges' commitment and ability to fully develop their primary commitment in other areas.

We propose that it be the intent of the Legislature that:

40. That the Board of Governors collect statewide data on community service programs and institute full, uniform cost accounting procedures, including direct and indirect costs, to ensure that no State funds are used for their support. (MPC REC. #28)

41. That the Legislature, having already established the "no State support/full fee support" policy for community service programs, establish no further rules regarding these programs. (MPC REC. #29)

42. That the colleges continue to offer community service classes according to the interests of the community, as long as those classes are fully user fee supported and do not detract from the colleges' primary responsibilities. (MPC REC. #30)

IV. FACULTY, ADMINISTRATORS AND STAFF

Education is not adequately defined by Mission statements, the names of programs, or the process guaranteeing access or standards. It lives in the encounter between student and teacher, in the animated dialogue among students, in the silence of reading or the quiet completion of a piece of work. Education escapes, finally, even the bureaucracies which house it or the funds which fuel it. It only happens through the complexity of mind and commitment of spirit which makes teaching a true vocation and being a student a rare joy.

We recognize the subtlety of good teaching, and value those who do it well and with passion. We further understand that none of the State's needs will be met unless we have trained and committed faculty, joined by talented service staff and administrators. And while it remains obvious that the State requires faculty who are technically qualified and professionally trained, we believe that the tasks faced by Community College faculty require more. Our goal must be to create the best conditions under which men and women can commit themselves to teaching, the finest environments in which their minds and spirits are free to engage their students and each other. This vision must inform our recommendations, else they be programs without meaning in a context where meaning is all.

The following proposals combine with proposals made elsewhere under "Governance" to effect a major shift in the organization and governance of faculty affairs. In sum, and taking the proposals as a whole, we aim to increase the authority of a permanent full-time and tenured faculty more into the affairs of the college, while decreasing the districts' current dependence upon part-time temporary faculty. We intend that the faculty assume its proper role as a professional collegiate body. At the same time, we wish to strengthen the role and stability of those support and service staff without whom the entire process of assessment and counseling cannot succeed, and whose continuing engagement with students is a precondition of their success.

Credentials

We are not persuaded that the current credentialing system insures either quality or professionalism; it certainly has nothing to do with personal commitments or care. The requirements are minimal, the procedures automatic, the standards totally abstract. The idea of minimal criteria for faculty hires is unassailable; the real issues are: who should make the standards, who should make the hires, on what criteria? We believe that the question of standards is, finally, also a question of governance. If the faculty were more involved in the setting of standards and the real decisions of hiring, current credentials

would be largely irrelevant. Absent those elements, we are also aware that simply eliminating credentials is beside the point.

It is our intent:

43. That the existing credentialing system for community college faculty be deleted from the Education Code by June 30, 1988 on condition:

44. That the Board of Governors direct the Office of the Chancellor to convene a Task Force on Faculty and Administration with broad representation from all segments of the faculty and administration--paying special attention to the representation of faculty from different disciplines, programs, liberal arts and vocational training, remediation, and adult education, as well as gender and ethnic representation--to determine a new system of qualifications for employment of faculty and administrators. The task force is to consult broadly with business, labor and other interests. The task force shall submit preliminary proposals and recommendations to the Legislature by March 15, 1987, and serve as liaison to the Joint Committee for Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education as it considers and deliberates on comprehensive community college reform.

45. That the transition from the older credentialing system to the newer system of qualifications shall be accompanied by provisions "grandfathering" existing bargaining unit definitions.

It is our belief, further,

46. That the Board of Governors, in consultation with the above-mentioned task force, should determine a process through which the selection, retention and promotion of all faculty are subject to peer review, preferably on a departmental or division basis. Such peer review process shall give attention to the forthcoming demographics of California, and the recommendations in this report concerning affirmative action. The process shall include provisions that the peers reviewing are both representative of the diversity of California and sensitive to affirmative action concerns, all without compromising quality and excellence in teaching. The phasing in of this process is to begin no later than January 1, 1988. (McClintock dissent)

Recruitment and Affirmative Action

The California Community Colleges will face a severe hiring crisis in the next fifteen years. It is estimated that fully 55 percent of the current full-time faculty will retire in that period. There are three interlocking issues. First, there must be guarantees that these full-time positions are not divided into cheaper part-time positions, as is all too often the case currently. The maintenance of a fully staffed, full-time faculty is an essential element of a coherent program. Second, the very availability of qualified persons to fill these positions is in doubt. Competition for qualified persons is intense, from both other sectors of education and private business.

Finally, given the emerging turnover in faculty hiring, the next fifteen years represents the last major "window of opportunity" for the next 30 years to significantly change the ethnic mix within the faculty. Especially when the student body is changing, it will be imperative that the faculty be sympathetic and sensitive to the cultural diversity in the colleges; one means of ensuring this is a more representative balance among the faculty.

We propose, therefore, that it is the intent of the Legislature:

47. That the Commission on Financial Aid and the California Postsecondary Education Commission explore programs intended to increase the possibility of students entering the teaching profession in Community Colleges. A report is to be delivered to the Legislature no later than January 1, 1988.

48. That local districts and colleges explore agreements between their academic departments and graduate departments in adjoining campuses of the University of California and the California State University--such agreements aiming to provide part-time temporary positions to advanced graduate students with proven teaching experience (as Teaching Assistants), and who meet the required qualifications of community college faculty. Such positions would serve as a form of financial aid for the graduate student--especially for minority students--would also serve as recruitment avenues into Community College faculty ranks, and would guarantee the Community College departments one or two part-time temporary positions each year. The final hiring choices remain those of the Community College department and administration, from a pool of candidates provided by the UC and CSU graduate department. Such a program must include provisions that persons currently teaching part-time or full-time not be displaced.

49. That the California Postsecondary Education Commission study the design and feasibility of programs of graduate study leading to the Doctorate of Arts in Teaching in academic disciplines or fields. This degree is explicitly designed for men and women who seek on academic career in teaching and who are less involved in discipline-based research. CPEC is to deliver its critique, including the possibility of such degrees being offered through California's institutions, to the Legislature by July 1, 1988.

50. That the Board of Governors shall prepare a plan for strengthening Community College faculty and staff affirmative action policies and programs, and monitor and publish the results by college. Such policies and programs should include ethnic minorities, women, and disabled persons, and should establish local goals and expectations regarding affirmative action. Faculty and administrators shall be expected to have, and their selection, promotion, and retention process shall include, the recognition of and sensitivity to the individuality and diversity of Californians. The plan should include clear lines of district accountability for its success and ensure participation in and commitment to effective affirmative action by district trustees, administrators, and faculty alike. (c.f. MPC REC. #36) (McClintock dissent)

51. That the Chancellor's Office shall monitor local district and college progress, and where that progress fails to meet established goals, the Chancellor's Office shall mandate a review of local programs by a technical assistance team from the Chancellor's Office. (McClintock dissent)

Employment of Part-Time Faculty

If the Community Colleges are to respond creatively to the challenges of the coming decades, they must have a strong and stable core of full-time faculty with long-term commitments to their colleges. Most of our proposals in this report depend upon such a cadre of full-time faculty. We are concerned about the effect of an over-reliance upon part-time faculty, particularly in the core transfer curricula. Under current conditions, part-time faculty, no matter how talented as teachers, rarely participate in college programs, design departmental curricula, or advise and counsel students. Even if they were invited to do so by their colleagues, it may be impossible if they are simultaneously teaching at three or four other colleges in order to make a decent living.

At the same time, we are aware that in many areas the employment of part-time temporary faculty is both appropriate and necessary--especially in vocational programs

where faculty may be practicing professionals in the field. It is our belief, however, that decisions regarding the appropriateness of part-time faculty should be made on the basis of academic and program needs, and not for financial savings. It was the Legislature's concern about abuses in this regard that led to the establishment of the current statutory cap on part-time employment.

We are concerned about the current tendency to fill "retiring" full-time positions with multiple part-time positions, and we are further aware of the current financial incentive to do so. Under current formulae, part-time faculty receive less money than do full-time faculty (on any prorated accounting), and do not receive benefits. Thus, proposals concerning the status and conditions of part-time faculty will depend upon changes in the pay structure as well as the overall financing of the colleges.

We propose that it be the intent of the Legislature:

52. That the current statutory restriction on the employment of part-time faculty be maintained pending the development of a statewide policy for the Community Colleges by the Board of Governors. Such a policy must have the objective of strengthening the core of experienced full-time faculty in each department. Such a policy might appropriately be developed through a process of faculty and administrative consultation. (see, for contrast, MPC, REC. #37) (McClintock dissent)

53. That the Board of Governors develop policies requiring that part-time faculty who enjoy contractual status (see following recommendation), must participate in student advisement and curricular development in addition to classroom instruction. Part-time faculty are to be compensated for this participation. (c.f. MPC RECS. #38 and #44). This policy is obviously dependent upon the completion of the pilot project detailed in the following recommendation.

54. That the Board of Governors develop, and one or more districts adopt, a pilot program of two year "rolling" contracts for selected categories of part-time temporary faculty. Such a program shall include both peer and student review. Upon the completion of the pilot project, the Board of Governors is to develop, in consultation with the faculty, a policy of two-to-five year rolling contracts for selected categories of part-time faculty. Such a policy must be compatible with the Board of Governors' overall policy concerning the strengthening of the full-time faculty, and not be regarded as a substitute for the recruitment and tenuring of full-time faculty. (c.f. MPC RECS. #39 and #42) (McClintock dissent)

55. That the Board of Governors create and the Legislature fund a Special Instructional Fund (SIF) to be disbursed by the Board of Governors to local districts which make significant progress towards improving the ratio of full-time and part-time faculty, and in meeting affirmative action goals. Such progress shall be defined by the hiring of probationary full-time faculty to replace part-time temporary positions, (and, thus, improvement is not based on the simple expedient of laying off part-time faculty). Funds from the SIF shall be used for the development of new programs which require additional "start-up" monies. (McClintock dissent)

Tenure

We affirm the importance of the tenure system as the prerequisite for the maintenance of academic freedom, continuity in academic and vocational programs, and the development of a faculty committed to the long-term health of the community colleges. At the same time, we understand the tenure system to be a central part of the governance of the colleges. Thus, the determination of standards for tenure, procedures governing tenure, and the actual granting of tenure determine in large part the substantive direction of the colleges.

We find that the current tenure system lacks adequate participation by the faculty, provides an inadequate probationary period for the evaluation of permanent faculty, and does not provide uniform system-wide procedures for due process and grievance. Therefore, we propose that it is the intent of the Legislature:

56. That the Board of Governors, direct the Office of the Chancellor to convene a Task Force on Faculty and Administration to develop proposals for a formal system of peer review prior to the granting of tenure. Such a system must include adequate due process protections and grievance procedures. The task force shall submit preliminary proposals and recommendations to the Legislature by March 15, 1987, and serve as liaison to the Joint Committee for Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education as it considers and deliberates on comprehensive community college reform. (c.f. MPC REC. #41)

57. That the Board of Governors undertake a review of current practices concerning the tenuring of college administrators, and develop a process of peer and faculty review for administrators.

58. That current statute be amended to lengthen the probationary period to four years prior to the granting of tenure. Thus, during the fourth year of probationary service a review shall be undertaken of the probationary faculty's performance, according to the procedures determined by the Board in consultation with the faculty. If the probationary faculty is found qualified, tenure shall be granted. In the years prior to formal evaluation, termination during the first two years will not be subject to procedural due process. The denial of tenure shall be subject to due process and grievance, and shall be automatically followed by a fifth or "terminal" year of employment (as is the case in other segments of higher education).

Collective Bargaining

We recognize that changes in the governance of the colleges will affect, and be affected by, current collective bargaining agreements and the statutes governing those agreements. Both with regard to jurisdictional matters and questions of process, there can be considerable confusion regarding the relationship between collective bargaining agents, academic units organized through the colleges (departments and schools), and the academic senates. We are not persuaded that these matters are well understood currently.

Therefore, we propose that it is the intent of the Legislature:

59. That the Board of Governors review the Education Employment Relations Act with regard to the delineation of roles and responsibilities of the Academic Senate and the faculty bargaining agents, especially in light of proposed changes in the role of faculty concerning hiring, peer review and evaluation, and curricular design. The results of this review are to be submitted to the Legislature no later than July 1, 1988.

Student Services Staff

We affirm that the success of the assessment, counseling, and placement system will depend upon the commitment and dedication of trained student services staff. But the importance of their role stretches across all aspects of Community College life--in counseling, reading and computational assessment and evaluation, financial aid assistance, providing and directing tutorial services, providing outreach into the local community and information to continuing students, and assisting the faculty in designing and providing courses of study which meet the particular needs of very different students. We are concerned that the college have adequate service staff, and that they be superbly trained, especially in view of the current diversity in the colleges. It is our intention:

60. That the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education conduct a comparative review of the student services staffing and resources in the three systems of public higher education and adult education (including financial aid, personal counseling, health counseling, career counseling and placement, EOPS, handicapped services, and tutorial services); the results of this review should be communicated to the Legislature.

61. That the differential funding system developed by the Board of Governors adequately assess the workload factors for student services staff, especially in view of the requirements of the assessment, counseling and placement system, and that the funding be adequate to insure that there is both sufficient staffing and training for student services programs.

62. That both certified and classified student services staff be included in professional development programs (see below), especially those programs aimed at assessment methodologies, cultural and linguistic issues, program diversity, and personal/motivational factors central to student services.

63. That the CPEC/SAC study of financial aid programs intended to support Community College faculty include the feasibility of including under the same programs students who enter student services work as trained professionals.

Personal, Professional and Intellectual Development

The Master Plan Commission argues in its report that: "Community College instructors, recruited directly from graduate school or from some form of employment other than teaching, may not be prepared to deal effectively with the wide range of student abilities and attitudes found in Community College classrooms. As larger numbers of students from many different cultural backgrounds and with significant language and other deficiencies are enrolled, the problem will become more serious for both administrators and faculty. The establishment of the proposed student assessment, counseling, and placement program on each campus will also require additional training and assistance for both faculty and administrators."

We affirm the importance of professional development--for faculty, support staff, student services staff, and administrators--and believe that the Commission is correct in suggesting that the success of the assessment, counseling and placement program will depend upon training of faculty. Such education must include a thorough critique of the methodologies and procedures of current and proposed assessment instruments, the

significant variables and errors within all assessment, cultural and linguistic variables in and between the many communities served by the colleges, motivational and other personal factors central to collegiate success. Further, professional development programs shall include exploration of new ideas in pedagogical theory and practice, both within and across academic disciplines. In short, such programs in professional development must seek to engage faculty and administrators in pedagogical theory and practice, both within and across academic disciplines. In short, such programs in professional development must seek to engage faculty and administrators in the issues raised by the major transition through which the colleges are moving. It is our intent:

64. That the Board of Governors develop and implement a plan to strengthen professional development programs on Community College campuses. The programs should serve faculty, administrators, and staff alike. This plan shall take into account the findings and recommendations of the current California Postsecondary Education Commission study concerning staff development, and shall include whether and how an appropriation to the Board of Governors for allocation is appropriate and needed for this purpose among the participating colleges. (c.f. MPC REC. #46)

The recruitment of faculty into the Community Colleges, and the maintaining of morale and excitement among the faculty depends in large part upon the intellectual and personal environment within which faculty work. Much of that environment is created by their own authority over the substantive direction of the programs and courses in which they work, through the quality of their relationship with the college administration, and in the quality of their interactions with the communities of students they teach. At the same time, we recognize that faculty morale comes from their engagement in the development of new and innovative programs, from their engagement in professional and discipline-based associations, from an active intellectual life as scholars and teachers.

We recognize that faculty in the community colleges have substantially less resources available for professional and intellectual advancement than do faculty in the other segments, and that this disparity may become a substantial barrier to the future recruitment of a quality faculty. Yet, faculty in the Community Colleges can be no less intellectually engaged than their colleagues in the other segments. Their primary commitment to teaching makes even more imperative that they have a vibrant and rich intellectual life.

It is thus our intention:

65. That the Education Code governing the Community College Fund for Instructional Improvement be amended to include a category of "programs for the improvement of the intellectual environment of faculty and staff," and that such programs shall include, as eligible for grants:

- intersegmental summer programs (research projects and seminars) --college programs bringing visiting scholars to local districts**
- interdisciplinary programs involving local non-college institutions in the arts and sciences**
- intersegmental research and public information projects on topics of special concern to rural and urban California**
- regarding the environment, social history, and culture**
- summer "bridge" programs for the transition period into college life.**

66. That the Fund for Instructional Improvement be allocated sufficient funds for purposes of these programs and others.

Institutional Development

Finally, it is our conviction that a major intellectual task facing the Community Colleges is an ongoing review of the current organization of knowledge and learning through traditional academic disciplines. Especially at the introductory levels, and in many vocational programs, the Community Colleges could become the home of true and genuine interdisciplinary work. Such a focus, even if only in a pilot form, would give the colleges a special appeal to scholars and future teachers whose interests do not lie in the increasingly specialized confines of academic graduate disciplines. With this in mind,

67. We encourage the Chancellor's Office to explore, with the participation of one or more districts, establishing on a pilot basis, "interdisciplinary colleges" within selected colleges--with a special concern with the integration of vocational and academic study. The integration of work experience and study, and the provision of a more cooperative learning environment as a model for all colleges.

V. GOVERNANCE OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES

The governance system of the California Community Colleges will always bear a set of fundamental tensions. We seek a variety of ends through the governance system--governance which is simultaneously efficient and flexible, provides adequate fiscal oversight from the center and yet local initiative to design programs to meet local needs. These various purposes, and their attendant conflict, ought not to surprise us. They are rooted in a system of astonishing diversity, where local districts have for years been the primary governing structure. Upon this history of local control was grafted a centralized funding mechanism, and a set of legitimate state concerns regarding standards, criteria for programs, and success rates within the colleges.

We recognize the legitimacy of both local and state claims. It is perfectly appropriate that local districts whose communities have long supported their colleges should guard local control. Given the quite different needs of small rural towns and urban centers, of agricultural communities and high-tech suburbs, it is appropriate that local boards, local administrators, and local faculty should regard the development of programs as a local concern. At the same time, the state has a legitimate concern with the overall purposes of the system, the degree to which local programs meet the broad needs of the state, the efficient allocation of resources and overall equity between districts, the determination of standards, the relationship of the community college system with the other two segments of higher education, and the monitoring of the system's effectiveness.

We believe that a system of "Appropriate Governance" is not simply designed. It is built through successive efforts to maintain legitimate claims which sometimes clash. In the end, what constitutes "appropriateness" in any governing system is not its formal elegance, but its effectiveness in providing the services we seek through it. In the case of the community college system, we begin by asserting that the appropriate mode of governance is one of shared responsibility. The faculty should have responsibility over curricular matters, for example, but are appropriately accountable to statewide management standards.

The current division of responsibilities is spelled out in the Education Code, where the formal responsibilities of the Board of Governors and the Local District Boards is elaborated in detail. But such an elaboration does not translate into clarity in practice. We believe there are initiatives which could be undertaken now which could clarify current practice considerably, provide more accountability, and cause the Community College system to function more efficiently and effectively.

Board of Governors

The Education Code grants the Board of Governors broad authority with respect to academic standards, employment standards, program development, data collection, faculty and staff affirmative action, district development and interdistrict relations, budgeting and accounting procedures, relations with other segments and state bodies, as well as other duties. The granting of such authority recognizes that the Community Colleges do constitute a system of higher education--a system with common standards and practices even as it maintains local initiative and control. It is appropriate to make this recognition explicit; therefore, we propose to amend the Education Code to assert:

68. That there be created the California Community Colleges, a postsecondary education system which shall consist of Community College Boards established pursuant to law, and the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges.

It is further our intent:

69. That the primary role of the Board of Governors is to exercise broad statewide leadership within the system, to monitor local districts in their efforts to meet state goals, initiate statewide programs, and develop new budgeting priorities and formulae. It is also the appropriate body to provide fiscal management review and assistance in the event local boards encounter severe management difficulties. The responsibilities of the Board of Governor are detailed in current statute.

We agree with the Master Plan Commission that the effective provision of these and other powers requires changes within the structure of the Board of Governors and the Chancellor's Office. We propose:

70. That the voting membership of the Board of Governors include 13 appointive members appointed by the Governor and subject to two-thirds confirmation by the Senate, five ex-officio members to include the Governor, the Lt. Governor, the Speaker of the Assembly, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and the Chancellor, one voting student representative and one voting faculty member. Of the 13, at least two but not more than four shall be current or former elected members of local community college boards of trustees. Members shall be appointed to staggered six year terms. The ex-officio members may designate a proxy to participate as a board member in her/his absence, but without a vote.

71. That the membership of the Board of Governors be expanded by two, to include as ex-officio members the President of the University of California and the Chancellor of the California State University; such inclusion is to occur simultaneously with the expansion of both the Board of Regents of the University of California and the Board of Trustees of the California State University to include on both those boards as ex-officio members the Chancellors and/or President of the other two systems.

72. Pending the results of the Legislative Analyst's Office study called for by ACR 169, that the Board of Governors shall develop and maintain a classification structure for its employees. The classification structure shall be consistent with the other classification structures for the system-wide operations of the other postsecondary segments, and shall be designed to promote the development of the California Community Colleges as a system. The State Personnel Board and the Department of Personnel Administration shall approve the classification structure unless found substantially incompatible with the laws and regulations governing State Civil Service.

73. That the salaries of employees of the Board of Governors shall not be subject to the approval of the Department of Personnel Administration.

74. That the Legislature authorize the Board of Governors to submit a report to the Legislature concerning its determination where the Office of the Chancellor should be located so that it can carry out all of its responsibilities most effectively. If the Board of Governors determine that the office of the Chancellor shall be elsewhere than in Sacramento, the report shall justify this proposal. (MPC REC. #51)

75. That the Legislature direct the Board of Governors to issue an annual public progress report summarizing important aspects of the educational accomplishments of Community Colleges, especially as it relates to their own constituencies and plans and an annual status report on the and financial condition of each district according to assessment processes to be developed. (MPC REC. #52)

76. That the Board of Governors be authorized to conduct a management audit of any district according to previously determined criteria; that on the basis of the findings of the management audit the Board be authorized to recommend appropriate changes in the district's management practices. If the district subsequently fails to comply with those recommendations, the Board be authorized to implement appropriate sanctions, including appointment of a special trustee. (MPC REC. #53; this recommendation to follow procedures and provisions of AB 2910--Hughes)

77. That the Board of Governors conduct a thorough review of all statutes affecting the administration and operation of the Community Colleges, and recommend to the Legislature the amendment or repeal of those provisions affected by this set of proposals. Such a review is to be submitted to the Legislature no later than March 15, 1987.

78. That the Board of Governors develop and submit to the Governor an Affirmative Action Position Paper concerning its own membership; such a position paper should represent the Board's best judgment concerning the role of statewide representation of minorities, women, and the disabled, and aim to encourage the Governor to model the goals we ask of every district. It is the intent of the Legislature that the Board be broadly and equitably representative of the general public and assure that their combined appointments include adequate representation on the basis of sex and on the basis of the significant racial, ethnic, and economic groups in the state.

District Governing Boards

We understand that the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education is continuing its review of local "district organization and management," as a part of their ongoing review of the Master Plan. Therefore, we deem it inappropriate to comment on this area until such time as the Commission submits its proposals to the Legislature.

79. With regard to District Boards, the Joint Committee joins the Commission in recommending that elections for members of Community College district governing boards be held in November of even-numbered years.

Further we affirm,

80. That the Board of Governors, in cooperation with the district local trustees and other interested agencies, prepare and administer a systematic training program for its own members, to include district financial management, academic policymaking, collective bargaining, statewide standards, affirmative action, pedagogical theories and practices, and other matters essential to the effective operation of the Board of Governors. (MPC REC. #57)

Campus Governance

Whatever the formal relationships between the Board of Governors and the Local Districts, it is on the campuses that the daily decisions are made concerning programs and courses of study. We agree with the Master Plan Commission that the critical issue here is the assumption of authority by the Academic Senate over matters of curricular design and program development, the determination of local academic standards, and other academic matters. We do not agree that the hiring and evaluation of faculty is necessarily a task of the Academic Senate per se, even though it is properly a task of the faculty. With that caveat, we affirm:

81. That the local district trustees, in cooperation with the Board of Governors and other interested agencies prepare and administer a systematic training program for its own members that includes district financial management, academic policymaking, collective bargaining, statewide standards, affirmative action, pedagogical theme and practices and other matters essential to the effective operation of the Board of Governors.

82. That the Board of Governors should develop guidelines by which the role of the Academic Senate will be strengthened with regard to the determination and administration of academic and professional standards, course approval and curricula, and other academic matters.

83. That the Board of Governors should seek to clarify and define the role, responsibilities, and consequent accountability, of the Chief Executive Officers in the community colleges, including the role of the CEO in final hiring decisions, the accountability of the CEO for affirmative action and other hiring policies established by the Board of Governors and local boards, and the final responsibility of the CEOs for financial management at the campus level.

Further, we agree with the Master Plan Commission:

84. That the Board of Governors, working with district and student representatives, develop a plan for encouraging greater student participation in appropriate aspects of campus and district governance. (MPC REC. #59)

VI. COMMUNITY COLLEGE FINANCE

Any successful reform of Community College finance must be rooted in a critique of the current statewide funding system. Quite aside from the instability afforded by the successive changes in funding during the past eight years, the current system has major defects. The current mechanism bases state apportionment solely on classroom contact hours (ADA, or average daily attendance); this builds into the system the incentive to emphasize enrollments exclusively. The effects have included the programming of many low-cost programs, often taught by part-time instructors, to finance other programs, and the neglect of non-enrollment generating services like counseling. The most crucial difficulty with the ADA system is that it provides average revenues per credit ADA regardless of the mode of instruction, class size, status of faculty, or the provision of all other support services without which instruction can hardly continue.

In sum, the ADA mechanism bears almost no relationship to the actual cost of the real and different instructional and support services provided by the colleges. It rewards numbers; it contains no incentive for substantive success or performance; it may harm success by forcing districts to cut costs in programs which are "expensive" because they require technology or small classes.

Further, the finance system contains annual cost adjustments which bear no relationship whatever to the actual cost of providing services. The current statutory COLA consists of the ratio of the Implicit Price Deflator for State and Local Government Purchases of Goods and Services for the United States, of the fourth calendar quarter of the latest available year to the fourth calendar quarter of the prior year. This means that the largest amount of annual dollar increase for the Community Colleges is based on past changes in state and local government purchases of goods and services most of which have no relationship to higher education. One effect of this is the proliferation of categorical programs, since the general apportionment mechanism is so highly aggregated and far removed from actual costs.

What funding mechanism would remedy these defects, provide funding adequate to meet the needs of the colleges, and thus satisfy the goals of the state? A majority of this Committee agrees with the Master Plan Commission that a "Differential Funding" system would be a substantial improvement over the current system. In addition, we note that SB 851 expires July 1987. Accordingly, it is our intent:

85. That the Board of Governors convene, through the Office of the Chancellor, a Task Force on Community College Finance, for the purpose of developing specific proposals and recommendations concerning a new system for determining the allocation of state general apportionments to the California Community Colleges, including but not limited to differential funding and per capita funding. The Task Force shall develop models and simulations -- using the assistance of the California Postsecondary Education Commission and others -- to assess the costs and procedures required for developing and implementing and managing such a system. (Leonard dissent)

86. With regard to the study of differential funding, the Task Force shall examine a funding mechanism which may differentiate between the costs associated with the following categories: instruction, student services, academic support (library resources), institutional support (administration), plant operations and maintenance. The Task Force is to submit its preliminary proposals and recommendations to the Board of Governors and the Joint Committee no later than May 1, 1987, and serve as liaison to the Joint Committee as it considers community college reform in this area. (Leonard dissent)

- A. That the finance method shall replace, under the "Instructional" category, the ADA measurement of classroom contact hours be replaced by the FTE (full-time equivalent) measurement of student contact hours generated by the instructional activity.
- B. That the Task Force shall examine differentials within the "Instructional" category, including sub-categories based upon mode and cost of instruction. Such sub-categories may include, lecture, seminar, lecture-laboratory, high cost, low-cost apprenticeship. In addition, to these sub-categories, there should be two adjustments: (a) FTE taught by full-time instructors will generate a higher rate than FTE taught by part-time instructors; and (b) FTE in districts below a certain size will generate a higher rate to recognize their lack of economies of scale.

C. That funding for student services be provided not simply on a linear headcount basis, but on two sets of differentials. First, on the basis of services required at different general levels of enrollment (e.g., between 2,500 FTE and 3,000 FTE), thus establishing a buffer for sudden shifts in enrollment. Second, on the basis of differential student need, according to an index to be developed by the Chancellor's Office (e.g., percentage of students on financial aid, ethnic and linguistic minority enrollment, EOPS enrollment, etc.).

D. That Plant Operations and Maintenance formulae be based on an independent assessment of current square foot costs of adequate maintenance of facilities, and not based on historic expenditures per square foot (a figure currently artificially deflated due to retrenchment cuts).

E. That Institutional Support funding be determined on a base-period FTE basis, and adjusted only when FTE changed 15 percent up or down at the college level, thus insuring some stability in administrative ranks.

87. That the implementation of the new funding system begin in the 1988-89 budget year, phased in during a period not to exceed two years. (Leonard dissent)

88. That the introduction of the new funding mechanism shall not unduly harm or financially inhibit the functioning of any local district. Pains should be taken to develop a transitional process which provides relief for those districts whose resources will be seriously affected by the new formulae. (Leonard dissent)

89. That the Board of Governors review the current statutory COLA based on the price deflator, with a view to determining if there are more appropriate alternative measures. (Leonard dissent)

90. That the Board of Governors convene a broad-based task force which shall include, but not be limited to, representatives of the Chancellor's Office, the Department of Finance, the California Postsecondary Education Commission, the Legislative Analyst, Community College Faculty, students, local business and community organizations, to study and make recommendations concerning "performance-based funding" indices. The purpose of such study and proposals is to create an incentive system within the funding mechanism which would reward colleges for excellence, by means of a funding augmentation beyond the base formula. The indices for excellence shall include, but not be limited to, the following: transfer rates to other academic or vocational institutions, retention rates in programs and courses of study, recruitment, retention, transfer and placement by ethnicity and gender, vocational placement rates, skill-level assessment at exit of course and program, student satisfaction rates as measured by periodic student attitude surveys, articulation agreements with both high schools and other colleges and universities, provision of adequate student services according to the Chancellor's Office index of need. Such proposals are to be delivered to the Legislature no later than January 1, 1988. (Leonard dissent)

91. That upon the receipt and approval by the Legislature of the Board of Governor's proposal for a performance-based funding system, the Legislature shall create a Special Performance Fund from which local districts shall be eligible to draw special unrestricted augmentations between 1 and 4 percent of their annual operating budgets. (Leonard dissent)

92. That the Board of Governors, with the assistance of an advisory committee made up of representatives of Community College districts, county superintendents of schools, county treasurers, county auditors, and other interested county agencies, review current statutes regarding fiscal services provided Community College districts by county superintendents of schools to determine which functions might more appropriately be carried out by the Board of Governors or the districts and propose legislation to accomplish the transfer of these functions. (MPC REC. #65) (Leonard dissent)

It must be clear that the Legislature intends an explicit linkage between the assessment of students and the assessment of institutions. We aim to create and fully fund a finance mechanism which will provide incentives for districts to provide programs of

excellence for students. Assessment thus serves two functions. At entry, assessment serves to identify individual needs and abilities. At exit, assessment serves to identify the success of the schools in substantially increasing the students' capacities and options. Thus, the linkage between access and success is made tangible and real for both the student and the college. In the interim, we expect that the Master Plan Commission will study--and offer its recommendations--concerning a similar funding mechanism for both the University of California and the California State University.

APPENDIX A

DISSENTING OPINIONS

STATE CAPITOL
SACRAMENTO 95814
(916) 445-7552

DISTRICT OFFICE
1323 WEST COLTON AVENUE
SUITE 101
REDLANDS, CALIFORNIA 92374

(714) 798-4242 REDLANDS
(714) 383-4137 SAN BERNARDINO
800-325-9798 TOLL FREE

California Legislature



BILL LEONARD

STATE ASSEMBLYMAN

SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY

January 16 1987

COMMITTEES

WAYS AND MEANS
UTILITIES AND COMMERCE
EDUCATION
CONSUMER PROTECTION

SUBCOMMITTEES

WAYS AND MEANS
CHAIRMAN, EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION
EDUCATION

EDUCATION
HIGHER EDUCATION

JOINT LEGISLATIVE
BUDGET COMMITTEE

JOINT COMMITTEE FOR THE REVIEW OF THE
MASTER PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE OVERSIGHT OF
GAIN IMPLEMENTATION

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON
MEDICAL OVERSIGHT

SELECT COMMITTEE ON CHILD ABUSE

SELECT COMMITTEE ON LOW LEVEL
NUCLEAR WASTE

SELECT COMMITTEE ON
ALCOHOL AND RELATED PROBLEMS

Honorable John Vasconcellos
Joint Committee for the Review of the
Master Plan for Higher Education
State Capitol
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear John:

Below is my dissent statement with regard to items 85, and 86 of the Committee report. Please note I do not object to items 87 through 92 in fact I support these items.

The Committee majority has made it clear they favor a differential funding system for community colleges over the present system. While the present system must be changed it would be wrong to jump to even worse system in an effort to avoid the bad one. Differential funding is just that kind of nightmare.

First, the funding formula must of necessity be extraordinarily complex. The goal of a differential funding formula is to model community college expenditures by breaking them down into components then funding each component separately. It assumes that each of these components (instruction lecture, instruction lab, full time teacher, student services, plant operations and maintenance, and institutional support) can have their costs analyzed and that these costs are the same from campus to campus and district to district. In each of these components the same perverse incentive to grow bigger applies. An increase in building space will increase the building maintenance factor. An increase in full-time over part-time instructors will increase the formula. The district will argue that they have more of each of these factors or that the factor dollar value does not reflect their true need in providing that component.


Honorable John Vasconcellos
January 16, 1987
Page 2

Second, the more complex the formula, the further away from performance based funding we get. The differential funding formula concept is based upon the assumption that costs are fixed and can be calculated. It does not distinguish between quality programs. Unless of course the committee wishes to add another category to the list of components.

Third, this complex nonperformance based funding formula does not respond to the politicians bottom line question - how much is my district getting compared to what they got last year? If the formula by chance results in more money for that legislator's district then he or she is happy. If less money, then the legislator is going to demand that the formula be changed or that a new factor (remember the Peralta factor) be added.

Instead of a differential funding formula, which may be impossible to calculate and even harder to implement cleanly, lets move quickly to a 100% performance based funding formula that rewards quality programs or move to a per capita district allowance that is totally neutral on incentives and how districts should spend their money. I dissent to the Committee report recommending a differential funding formula.

Sincerely,



BILL LEONARD

BL:ab



Assembly California Legislature

STATE CAPITOL
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA
95814
(916) 324-4655

CURTIS RICHARDS
SENIOR CONSULTANT

GLORIA MEYERS
SECRETARY

MEMBERS

BILL BRADLEY
ROBERT CAMPBELL
TERESA HUGHES
SAM FARR
BILL LEONARD
TOM MCCLINTOCK
JOHN VASCONCELLOS

ASSEMBLY SUBCOMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION

TOM HAYDEN
CHAIR

26 January 87

Honorable John Vasconcellos
Chair, Joint Committee for Review
of the Master Plan for Higher Education
State Capitol
Sacramento CA 95814


Dear John:

I wish to formally express my dissenting view of the Joint Committee's action regarding the role of community colleges in providing English as a Second Language education.

I believe the Joint Committee should affirm the draft staff report which recommends that the Community Colleges "take a lead position in coordinating programs" in the areas of English as a Second Language (ESL). The program, which our own report defines as "the single largest categories of courses, with the largest enrollment, across all segments of education in California," and as "the heart of California's transition to a future as a multi-cultural society," lacks any central leadership and coordination. It is the orphan of higher education programs.

In our rush to identify community colleges with postsecondary education, which I support, we should not be so rigid as to pass over this opportunity for the colleges to once again lead in their traditional role of creating opportunities for the disadvantaged to reach the mainstream.

Sincerely,


TOM HAYDEN

Please Reply to:

Sacramento Address ☐
State Capitol
Sacramento 95814
Telephone: (916) 445-7402

District Office ☐
Paseo Camarillo
350 N. Lantana Street
Suite 222
Camarillo, CA 93010
Telephone: (805) 987-9797
ATSS 8-723-4530
Thousand Oaks (805) 499-7076
Ventura (805) 654-4530

Assembly California Legislature

THOMAS McCLINTOCK
ASSEMBLYMAN, THIRTY-SIXTH DISTRICT

ASSEMBLY REPUBLICAN WHIP

Committees:
Ways & Means
Revenue & Taxation
Education
Policy Research

Subcommittees:
Subcommittee on Higher Education
Ways & Means Subcommittee No. 1
on Health and Welfare
Ways & Means Subcommittee No. 2
on Education



February 24, 1987

Hon. John Vasconcellos, Chairman
Joint Committee for the Review of the
Master Plan
State Capitol, Room 6026
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear John:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Joint Committee's Final Report on Community College Reform. Generally speaking, I believe that the reforms recommended by the committee constitute a substantial improvement over the current community college system. The prioritizing of missions -- placing top priority on transfer and vocational education -- provides a clear and unambiguous direction for a community college system adrift in a sea of competing demands. I believe the committee's decision to scrap the present system of ADA funding in favor of a more realistic differential funding mechanism is long overdue and that the emphasis on matriculation and tenure reforms will assure a much more efficient and purposeful use of every educational dollar.

I do wish to express my strong reservations on three aspects of the report.

First, I dissent from the repeated proposals that the hiring of faculty and the admission or recruitment of students should be on any factor other than their qualifications or academic promise. I think it is intensely insulting to any ethnic, religious, or racial group to imply that special consideration should be granted to all members of that group to compensate for some implicit shortcoming. I believe that the hiring and admission of faculty and students should be done on an individual basis. It is distressing to me how little attention is given to Martin Luther King's vision of a world where an individual is judged "on the content of his character and not the color of his skin." The

Hon. John Vasconcellos
February 24, 1987
Page 2

committee's recommendations are rife with a contrary vision of which I do not approve.

Second, I question the number of ancillary missions with which this committee would still burden the community colleges. I believe that one of the principal causes for the decline of the community college system in recent years has been the proliferation of missions so diverse and numerous that none can be adequately addressed. I am concerned that the committee's report promises more than the system can deliver -- an absolutely open enrollment regardless of a student's proficiency or promise and as many courses as the imagination can devise.

Sadly, remedial education will be necessary in many cases to overcome the deficiencies of the public school system, and to provide intensified English instruction for those to whom English is a second language. But I seriously question whether we should further distract the mission of the colleges to functions which should be left to other sectors of the community. It seems to me that general adult education and fee-supported services are more appropriate to public school adult education programs, park and recreation department offerings, and the private sector.

Thomas Jefferson was correct when he said, "The Government that attempts to do more than it ought will perform less." A community college system pulled in five or six different directions will also be crippled from performing its primary missions. I do not believe that the community colleges should be looked upon as a smogasbord to satisfy everybody's educational whims, but rather as a solid three-course meal to satisfy the serious societal need for well-trained personnel in the vocational and professional world.


Finally, I do not share the preoccupation of the committee with respect to a full-time teaching faculty. I question whether by accepting this plan, we are denying ourselves the tremendous pool of talent and resources in the professional world who simply are not available to teach full time. I am afraid that the committee's recommendation will produce an inbred, barnacle-encrusted faculty without the flow of new ideas and approaches that part-time instructors offer. A business executive, for example, teaching one class in business administration may be worth two full-time faculty members with limited practical experience in the field they teach. If the community colleges are to be the innovative and vibrant force the report's prelude

Hon. John Vasconcellos
February 24, 1987
Page 3

suggests, then a part-time segment of the faculty should play an important role.

With these reservations noted, I otherwise support the report.

Sincerely,



TOM McCLINTOCK

TM:ar

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES
JUL 10 1987